WHO ARE THE DISUNIONISTS?

BRECKINRIDGE AND LANE,

THE TRUE UNION CANDIDATES.

(Extract from Mr. Breckinridge's address on the removal of the Senate from the old to the new Chamber, January 4, 1859.

"Such is our country; aye, and more—far more than my mind could conceive or my tongue could utter. Is there an American who regrets the past? Is there one who will deride his country's laws, pervert her Constitution, *or alienate her people?* If there be such a man, let his memory descend to posterity laden with the execrations of all mankind. * * * Let us devoutly trust that another Senate, in another age, shall bear to a new and larger Chamber this Constitution vigorous and inviolate, and that the last generation of posterity shall witness the deliberations of the Representatives of American States *still united*, prosperous and free."

(Extract from Mr. Breckinridge's speech at the serenade in Washington city, June 26, 1860.)

"When that Convention selected me as one of its candidates, looking at my humble antecedents and the place of my habitation, it gave to the country, so far as I was concerned, a personal and geographical *guarantee* that *its interest was in the Union.*"

(Extract from Mr. Breckinbridge's speech at Frankfort, July 18, 1860.)

"I am an American citizen—a Kentuckian, who never did an act or cherished a thought that was not *full of devotion to the Constitution and the Union.*"

(Extract from Mr. Breckiridge's letter of acceptance.)

"The Constitution and the equality of the States—these are the symbols of EVERLASTING UNION. Let these be the rallying cries of the people.

(Extract from Gen. Lane's speech in the Senate, December 19, 1859.)

"No man loves the Union more than I do, and no one would make greater sacrifices to maintain and preserve it. I would do it at the moment when the country requires it at the expense of every drop of blood."

(Extract from Gen. Lane's speech at the Serenade in Washington city, June 26, 1860.)

"I have been influenced from early manhood to this moment by love of country; and I shall ever continue to be a patriot and a true friend of the Constitution and the Union. Let no man ever say that there was any disunionism in the Convention which placed in nomination the gallant and gifted Kentuckian, and associated my name on the ticket, for no living man would go further to preserve this Union than I would; none would go further than John C. Breckinridge. "*The Union must be preserved. It shall be preserved.*"

Yet, with a full knowledge of the views of our gallant standard bearers, with a full knowledge of the fact that they have never breathed one word that the most wicked and perverse imagination could conjure into even the shadow of a want of fealty and allegiance to the Constitution and the Union, with a full knowledge of the fact that not only in words but in *deeds* upon the field of battle, (which was never graced with the presence of Douglas and Johnson, Bell and Everett, or Lincoln and Hamlin,) when armies met armies in the fierce shock of war, Breckinridge and Lane alone of all the candidates *attested* their deep devotion and attachment to the country. Aye, in the face of their spotless record, their revolutionary ancestry, and their gallant conduct in upholding the flag of their country upon a foreign soil, while the other candidates were reposing in ease at home, and some of them, too, giving aid and comfort to the enemy, we find men so utterly reckless of truth as to give utterance to the foul libel that they are the candidates of disunionists. And upon what ground do they, put forth a slander so base and false? Why, beecause some of the supporters of Mr. Breckinridge have at some period of their lives said, that if the North trampled upon the constitutonal rights of the South and attempted by intolerable oppression and the enactment of unconstitutional laws to degrade, debase, and crush her, she would be justifiable in seceding, and because a few others of his advocates proclaimed that the election of Fremont in 1856, and Lincoln in 1860, would lead to a dissolution of

the Union. Now, if the promulgation of these sentiments shows Messrs. Yancey and Keitt to be disunionists, we aver that we are prepared to brand the charge of disunion not only upon the brows of the chief supporters of Douglas and Johnson, and Bell and Everett, but upon the brows of these candidates themselves. We go still further, say we are prepared to establish that the politicians who, either by insisting upon unreasonable conditions as the only means of preserving the Union, by counselling resistance to the Government on account of *past wrongs*, had come to be known all over the country as disunionists *per se*, are now to be found in the Douglas and Bell camps. And in proof of our assertions, we appeal to the record.

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS.

Come upon the stand, Mr. Douglas. You and your friends have classified the supporters of Mr. Breckinridge as disunionists because some of them have said that the election of Fremont or Lincoln would lead to a dissolution of the Union. What did *you* say in 1856?

At a Democratic meeting called to ratify the nominations of Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Breckinridge in Washington city, June 7, 1856, Mr. Douglas said:

"This Union was made through the Constitution AND CANNOT SURVIVE FOR A SINGLE DAY the obligations of that instrument. * * * Can this Union be preserved in the hands of a political party whose principle of action is hostility on the part of one-half of the States against the rights and institutions of the other half of this Union? Can sectional strife, sectional animosity, and sectional warfare produce that fraternal feeling and brotherly love which is *essential to preserve* the Republic as our fathers made it? *No less than the integrity of the Constitution*, THE PRESERVATION AND PERPETUITY OF THE UNION DEPEND UPON THE RESULT OF THIS ELECTION.

At a ratification meeting in the city of New York, on the 11th of June, 1856, Mr. Douglas said

"Their (Republican) doctrines were sectional, and would tend to arm father against son, and brother against brother, *to subvert the Constitution*, AND FINALLY TO PROSTRATE THE UNION NEVER TO RISE AGAIN."

In a speech delivered in the Senate, August 27, 1856, Mr. Douglas said:

"It is a painful reflection that one of the great political parties of the country allow passion, or prejudice, or ambition to urge them to an extent that *would destroy the very temple of liberty* in which we are assembled. I believe that it is *a question* OF UNION OR DISUNION, depending upon preserving the Constitution of the United States inviolable."

The Chicago Times, the home organ of Mr. Douglas, in a recent issue, (August, 1860,) uses this language:

"It is worse than madness for us to suppose that a continuance of the present state of affairs is consistent with a perpetuity of the Union. People *cannot* and *will not long remain together* when all the ties of affection and respect that bound them together are rent asunder. SUCH A UNION IS NEITHER SUFFERABLE NOR DESIRABLE."

According to the Douglas National Executive Committee, Mr. Douglas stands branded as a disunionist! There we leave him.

ROBERT J. WALKER, OF MISSISSIPPI.

In a letter written by Mr. Walker in 1856, he said:

"The Union between the North and the South, so far as the votes for the sectional candidates of the so-called 'Republican' party is concerned, is ALREADY DISSOLVED; for no man anticipates a solitary electoral vote for those candidates in any State of the South; but this controversy is to be settled exclusively in favor and by the exclusive vote of the North, and *the rights, wishes, and interests of the South are to be wholly disregarded.*"

HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON, OF GEORGIA.

This gentleman, candidate for Vice President, was in the Senate of the United States by appointment of the Governor of Georgia, for a little over a year. Let us see what he had to say on the question of disunion:

"This Union never could have been formed upon any other basis than those of the most perfect equality between the States. The slave States never would have entered into the compact upon any other condition. They never would have agreed to it if they could have even anticipated that a methodical and organized attack would have been made by Congress upon their domestic institutions. Sir, it is all in violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution. It is at war with everything like good faith and political fraternity. *It must cease*, OR THE UNION WILL BE DESTROYED; *it cannot withstand an* agitation so vital, so fundamental. It affects the *very foundation of the Government*, and if continued WILL LAY THE GLORIOUS FABRIC IN RUINS. * * * * * It has been intimated during this debate that the South would finally submit to the aggressions of the North. *Let not gentlemen deceive themselves.* * * Is it supposed that the people of the South are dastardly; that they are not serious in their public resolves; and that they have so far degenerated from the chivalry of their ancestry as to pass complacently under the iron yoke of northern aggression? Let not gentlemen deceive themselves. The South have too much at stake.—Their domestic peace, their property, their honor, their all, are involved in the contest. Not less than ten hundred millions in value of their slave property are jeopardied by this spirit of fanaticism and aggression.

"Does the history of the world furnish a single instance of a people so *craven-hearted* as to submit to the unresisted hazard of the security and safety of so vast an amount of property. I ask gentlemen to study well the value of the interests involved, and the lofty element of southern character, before they mature the opinion that the southern States *will tamely submit* to insult, degradation, and plunder under the forms of legislation. * * * * * What the South means is this: Having entered the Union in good faith, she will abide the compromises of the Constitution; and she expects the North to do likewise. But if this cannot be so; if, having the numerical majority, the North will trample upon our rights, outrage our feelings, and disregard our political equality as confederates, WE CANNOT BE HELD TO ABIDE THE VIOLATED BOND.—* * * * The Union of our affections is that which was formed by the Constitution, 'to establish justice, *insure domestic* tranquillity,' &c. If, through the blindness of fanaticism or the folly of unwarrented legislation, it becomes subversive of these ends, and be transformed into an engine to oppress the South, *it will cease to be an object of love and pride*, AND WILL FORFEIT ALL TITLE TO HER ALLEGIANCE."—See App. to Cong. Globe, 2d Sess. 30th Cong. page 304.

This portion of Mr. Johnson's history would be incompiete unless we add that he raised the banner of resistance to the Compromise measures of 1850, and sought by his eloquence, ability, and influence, to induce the State of Georgia to *secede from the Union* on account of those measures. We regret that our limited space will not allow us to give extracts from his speeches in that campaign.

We come down to a later date. On the 29th of September, 1856, Mr. Johnson wrote a letter to the editor of the Philadelphia North American, which we find republished in the Washington Union of Oct. 16, 1856, from which we make the following extract:

"I suppose Mr. Fremont, if elected, will prove true to his own declarations, to the platform of his party, and the expectations of his party supporters. If so, his election will inaugurate a line of public policy and congressional action that MUST DRIVE THE SOUTHERN STATES TO DISSOLUTION. He may deceive his party, &c. But this you will allow, is rather a *broken reed* for the South to lean upon; and therefore, *his election will be the signal for her to prepare for the worst.* If he redeem his pledges to his party, and his party redeem their pledges to the country, *it will not be in the power of human wisdom to save the Union.* * * And seeing this, is it to be supposed that the southern States *will quietly* AWAIT *their own ruin?* Will they not take their own protection into their own hands, IN ADVANCE *of the catastrophe?* * * * Is it supposed that the South is so blind as not to foresee the consequences; and can it be expected that she will stand still and AWAIT *their arrival* before she will resort to defensive action? Vain and idle is such an expectation. * * * The southern States are not to be deceived. True to the instinct of self-preservation, if not impelled by higher impulses, *they will not* WAIT until they are fettered before they resort to means of defence, if they can, OR RESISTANCE, if they must."

Read all these extracts, study well their import, and say, is not Herschel V. Johnson a disunionist of the rankest stamp?

PIERRE SOULE, OF LOUISIANA.

This gentleman, who was smuggled into the Douglas Baltimore Convention as a delegate from Louisiana, and who there voted and advocated Mr. Douglas' nomination, was some years ago a United States Senator, and we well recollect the vehemence with which he opposed the Compromise measures of 1850, and proclaimed that he was willing to "rupture the Union" because the *boundaries* of a proposed State (California) were too large! In answer to Mr. Douglas he said that if her boundaries were changed he would vote for her admission, but if not, it was sufficient cause to "rupture the Union!" Hear him, the italics and capitals are his own:

"The whole matter of the boundary, then, was cunningly devised to be merely *nominal*, purposely *unreal*, and thoroughly *deceptive*. It was to be *effective* and *irreversible* for a single object—*to exclude the South forever from all share in the Territories, through spoliations of her rights, and a degradation of her sovereignty, without an alternative that does not end in an inglorious submission*, OR A RUPTURE OF THE UNION. * * * This measure (the admission of California) will pass, I have no doubt, but its consummation will be the consummation of one of the most grievous, the most revolting, and the most unjustifiable wrongs that can be inflicted upon a people living as we do under a constitutional compact. * * * Now I ask the Senators who compose a majority, through whose vote this measure is to pass, I ask them, do they think that the people of the South will long brook and endure such enormities? Do they suppose that they could quietly submit? *Then truly would those masters of slaves* DESERVE TO BE SLAVES THEMSELVES, *that they could be reconciled to a condition where to submit to disgrace, were prudence, and to be contemptible, a necessity.*"—See App. Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong., page 1520.

And all this solely because the *boundaries* of a State were in his estimation too large! Can the Douglas Committee point to any expression uttered by any friend of Mr. Breckinridge so intensely disloyal and disunion as these remarks of Mr. Soulé? But the Compromise measures were passed in spite of his opposition. Did he then yield? No, he went home and raised the banner of resistance to them. In a speech delivered in New Orleans, November 30, 1850, we find him holding this language:

"Will I counsel you to submit? NO! NEVER. * * * * I can only hurriedly, sketch such *remedies* as have suggested themselves to my mind. We must first assert that the late measures of Congress inflicted wrongs on the South which *must be redressed.* Such of these measures as may be repealed, you ought to insist upon being repealed. Of that character is the abolition of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. Moreover, you should *demand some compensation for past injuries and wrongs, and some security for the future—some certain guarantee against continued aggression—something that can give you peace and security in the Union.* (This alluded to the amendment to the Constitution for two Presidents, one from the North and one from the South proposed by Mr. Calhoun.) When you have obtained this justice, then sing pieans to this Union. If, however, you wish to invite and encourage further aggression—if you wish to bring dishonor, disgrace, and ruin on the South—to make our lovely country, a prairie in the Republic, composed of dependents on the favor of the strong, and suppliants of their rights *—then submit to these oppressions,* AND SINK TO THE LEVEL OF YOUR SLAVES AND TAKE THEIR *places in the social and political scales!* * * * Let us not bend submissively to wrong, but, knowing our rights, *let us dare maintain them.*"

MILES TAYLOR, OF LOUISIANA.

This gentleman is a member of Congress, and chairman of the Douglas National Executive Committee. In this latter capacity he has recently issued a document to prove that Mr. Breckinridge is the candidate of disunionists, and then in the most Pharasaical spirit, he adds, "Thank God, no disunionists sustains S. A. Douglas and H. V. Johnson!" It is exceedingly strange how soon some men forget their own history and record, perhaps, because there is nothing creditable in them to remember. Mr. Taylor always has belonged to the Soulé fire-eating school of Louisiana. He and Mr. Soulé are bosom friends, linked together in the same political faction and working for a common end. Let us hear what he had to say in Congress about disunion:

"If the counsels of these men (the Republicans) find favor with us, A FEW SHORT WEEKS, *or months* may be sufficient to fill a land where it has been an sunshine, *with "clouds and darkness;"* and amid the surrounding gloom such *contentions and conflicts* may arise, *in which section may be arrayed against section, State against State, and perhaps man against man,* IN DEADLY STRIFE, as would make all men * * shudder with fear."—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 34th Congress page 187.

Again, on page 885, Mr. Taylor said:

"And what will be the *inevitable result* of this state of things, growing out of this crusade against the South which is now preached with such zeal and fury by so many northern priests and northern politicians? I will tell you. If these furious and repeated assaults upon Southern rights and Southern feelings shall at last shake and loosen, in the hearts of southern men, the love and reverence for the Union which constitute the foundations on which repose the pillars supporting our national Government, *as they* INEVITABLY *will do, that mighty fabric* WILL TOPPLE OVER, *and rush ng to to base,* THE NATION ITSELF WILL BE SHATTERED INTO FRAGMENTS, and the altars of true religion will be overturned with the priests who now desecrate them by their false doctrines, *and be bur ed deep beneath* THE AWFUL RUINS."

There, that will do for the chairman of the Douglas Executive Committee! "Thank God, no disunionists support Douglas and Johnson!"

A. H. STEPHENS, OF GA.

Mr. Stephens, we regret to see, is one of the Douglas electors at large, for the State of Georgia. We propose to give a few short extracts from his speeches in Congress:

"I tell that gentleman, and I tell this House, that the day in which aggression is consummated upon my section of the country, much and deeply as I regret it, THIS UNION IS DISSOLVED. * * * I tell you, for one, before that God who rules the universe, I would rather that the southern country should perish—that all her statesmen and all her gallant spirits should be buried in honorable graves, than submit for one instant to degradation.—Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong. page 29.

The President (Mr. Fillmore) having sent a message to Congress that he had given orders to extend the authority of the Federal Government over the disputed territory between Texas and the Government, Mr. Stephens said:

"And now, in conclusion on this branch of the subject, I assert that if he (the President) attempts thus by by force to arrest the legal authorities of Texas, it will be a gross usurpation of power which *should be resisted.* And if you wish to know what I mean by resistance, or how it should be resisted, I say distinctly, it should be resisted *by arms.* * * * And no man need delude himself with the opinion, that in such a conflict Texas would be alone. I have lately expressed the opinion that *the first Federal gun that shall be fired against the people of Texas without the authority of law, will be the signal for the freemen from the Delaware to the Rio Grande* TO RALLY TO THE RESCUE. * * *

"I do not place a low estimate upon the value of the Union to the State; but I do *not* consider its dissolution, with all the manifold attending evils of such an event in full view before me, as *the greatest calamity* that could befall us. *Far from it.* * * * Whenever the Government is brought in hostile array against me and mine, I AM FOR DISUNION—openly, boldly, and fearlessly, for REVOLUTION. * * * When that day comes, if it ever does, 'DOWN WITH THE GOVERNMENT,' will be my motto and watchword."—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong., page 1,083.

HENRY S. FOOTE, OF TENNESSEE.

This gentleman, formerly United States Senator from Mississippi, now of Tennessee, comes next in the list. Hear him:

"Yes, sir, I have examined this subject in all its bearings, * * and I have no hesitation in declaring it as my solemn conviction that if California is dragged into the Union in the mode now proposed, the southern States will feel that such intolerable oppression has been already imposed upon them as to *justify, nay, to* DEMAND SECESSION FROM THE UNION, in order to save themselves from evils still worse than disunion itself."—Cong. Globe, 1st Ses. 31st Cong., page 366.

Again, on page 403, Mr. Foote said

"Now, when our adversaries have threatened us with utter destruction, * * now, the Honorable Senator (Mr. Clay) beseeches us to be patient, and moderate and kind; to trust to the mercies of those whose hearts seem steeled to all the tender charities of life, and to remain ingloriously inactive whilst the fetters of a degrading thraldom are fixed upon our free limbs. * * Well, sir, whatever others may say or think, I declare it to be my solemn and deliberate opinion that if the aggressions now threatened shall actually take place, or wrongs heretofore perpetrated upon the South shall remain much longer unredressed, *it will be* IMPOSSIBLE FOR THIS UNION TO HOLD TOGETHER SIX MONTHS LONGER."

Only a few days ago, in a speech in New York city, Mr. Foote announced that if Lincoln be elected, "*all the efforts of all the Union men, North and South, would not be sufficient* TO PREVENT THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CONFEDERACY."

HIRAM WARNER, OF GEORGIA,

A leading Douglas man, was a member of the Thirty-Fourth Congress, and delivered one of the ablest speeches we ever heard on the subject to prove that slave property ought to be protected in the Territories, and that the South ought to submit to no restriction upon this right. He said:

"They (the southern States) OUGHT NOT to submit to it upon *principle,* if they could, and *could not if they would.*

"It is in view of these things, sir, that the people of Georgia have solemnly resolved that if Congress shall pass a law excluding them from the common Territory with their slave property, they WILL DISRUPT THE TIES THAT BIND THEM TO THE UNION."—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 34th Cong. pages 297, 300.

ISAAC E. MORSE, OF LOUISIANA,

Is an ex-member of Congress, and was one of the bogus delegates to the Douglas Baltimore Convention. He enjoys also, like his friend Soulé, the unenviable notoriety of having opposed the Compromise measures of 1850, and clamoring for an amendment of the Constitution according to Mr. Calhoun's programme. Let us listen to him awhile:

"These things (the agitation and discussion of slavery) cannot last, *and the Union continue.* Why, if no legislative enactments of an offensive character were ever passed, the indulgence of their feelings will *ultimately estrange these parties.* * * * * * * The first hostile movement was made when Missouri applied to be admitted into the Union. After five months of angry discussion, that State was admitted, and the

Missouri Compromise passed. * * * There was the fatal error of the people of the South. THEY SHOULD HAVE RESISTED AT EVERY HAZARD. (*as they must do at some time or other*) every attempt to prevent them from going, when they please, where they please, *and with what property they please*, into any and all the territory of the United States, every acre, every foot—aye, every spoonful of which was the community property. * * * * * * If it shall be shown by the legislation and practice of this Government, that the provisions of the Constitution are not sufficient to secure all the rights of property in slaves in *esse posse, manendo, et eundo. I desire to have additional guarantees.*

Yet, exclaims the Hon. Miles Taylor, 'Thank God, no disunionists support Douglas and Johnson!"

In the Alexandria (Va.,) Sentinel of the 24th Oct., 1856, we find a speech from this same Mr. Morse, from which we quote:

"He (Mr. Morse) was a States-right man *of the ultra sort.* He had looked with deep concern at the threatened election of Fremont. * * *Rather than submit to such a wrong and indignity*, he spoke the sentiment of his people when he said, *the South would have thrown herself back on her rights and honor.*"

E. C. CABELL, OF MISSOURI.

This gentleman was formerly a member of Congress from Florida, but now resides in Missouri.—He is very free in his denunciations of the Yancey-Disunionists, as he terms the supporters of Mr. Breckinridge. Let us see what he once said on the subject:

"This Union was formed on calculation—on the very nicest calculation, and can only be continued on calculation. * * * *We have resolved* TO RESIST AT EVERY HAZARD, AND TO THE LAST EXTREMITY, what is called the 'spirit of the age,' which would array the powers of the Government against the interests of our section. * * * REVOLUTION—DISUNION, *will be the* INEVITABLE consequence of the consummation of these measures."

After arguing strongly in favor of the *equal rights* of the Southern people to have their property *protected* in the Territories, Mr. Cabell announced:

"WE CAN ONLY REMAIN IN THE UNION AS YOUR EQUALS. * * * If we do tamely submit to what is proposed, my friend from North Carolina says we deserve to be whipped through our fields by our slaves. I think, sir, we shall merit the deeper disgrace of being kicked at every corner of the streets, by that gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Giddings) who has sneeringly told us, we could not be kicked out of the Union."

EX-GOV. WINSTON, OF ALABAMA,

Is a Douglas elector in that State. On the 7th Nov. 1857, in his message to the Legislature, he said:

"*The Union is not with us of the South, a "paramount political good,"* however much we may, and do, desire its continuance under a strict adherence to constitutional provisions and guarantees. When these can no longer be maintained—*or when further aggressions upon our rights is practiced* by a dominant political power at the North—*we have everything to gain and nothing to lose, by* DISRUPTING EVERY TIE THAT BINDS US TO THE CONFEDERACY."

THE ATLANTA (GA.) CONFEDERACY,

The leading Douglas paper in that State, in a recent issue, says:

"WHAT WILL THE SOUTH DO IF ABRAHAM LINCOLN IS ELECLED PRESIDENT? We answer this interrogatory by simply stating that the South WILL NEVER PERMIT *Abraham Lincoln to be inaugurated* President of the United States. *This is a settled and settled fact.* Let the consequences be what they may—*whether the Potomac is crimsoned in human gore, and Pennsylvania Avenue is paved ten fathoms in depth with mangled bodies;* or whether the last vestige of liberty is swept from the face of the American Continent, the South will NEVER SUBMIT to such humiliation and degradation as the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln."

The same paper, in another issue says that unless "the compromise measures of 1850 and the restrictions upon the African slave trade are repealed, *we are emphatically and unequivocally for* DISUNION"

The disunionists in Georgia, under the eye of their old leader, H. V. Johnson, are battling with all their might for Douglas. And so all over the South. Is it possible that their deep-laid scheme of dividing the Democratic vote by running Mr. Douglas, thereby electing Lincoln, and then raising the banner of disunion, as they did in 1850, will succeed.

BELL AND EVERETT, ALSO THE CANDIDATES OF DISUNIONISTS.—The peculiar friends of Mr. Bell, taking the cue from their Douglas allies, are also retailing the base calumny that the supporters of Mr. Breckinridge are disunionists. And we regret to see that even Mr. Crittendon has lent himself to the promulgation of the slander, though he admits that Mr. Breckinridge himself is a "sound Union man." Is it not a contradiction on its face to say that disunionists are laboring to elect "a sound Union man" in order to break up the Union! Yet such is the twaddle to which Mr. Crittendon treated his Louisville audience. We use the words "*peculiar* friends of Mr. Bell," in order to draw a line of distinction between them and the Douglas men in the South who are supporting him (Bell.) The people cannot fail to have perceived the perfect fusion and coalition going on between the friends of these two candidates. The friends of the one are the friends of the other. All over the South and the North they are *banded* together against Mr. Breckinridge. All the disunionists from the South heretofore mentioned in this document, as the friends of Mr. Douglas, are also the friends and supporters of Mr. Bell through the coalition entered into between them. So that in classing the disunionists for Bell, we must take those already given as for Mr. Douglas. This renders our task under this heading an easy one.

JOHN BELL, OF TENNESSEE.

We know the gentleman well. We know his vacillating course in the Senate, how he at one time when desiring place and position from Tennessee, he could play the part of a blustering fireeater, and how at another time, when the rich bait of a Presidential nomination was held out to him by such men as Horace Grecly, Wilson & Co., he

deemed it not dishonorable to consort and vote with the Abolitionists of the Senate against his own section of the country. But it is not our purpose now to point out his inconsistencies. We desire at this time merely to hear from him on the question of disunion. What does he say:

"Sir, no man who loves his country, no man who has any just pride in the reflection that he is an American citizen, but must desire that these dissensions should cease. For, sir, it is not a mere question whether we shall preserve the Union; for that may be and yet prove no great boon either to ourselves or posterity. The question is not whether the States shall continue united according to the letter of the covenant by which they are bound together. It is, whether they shall continue to be practically and efficiently co-operative in carrying out the great ends of the association. The question is whether mutual trust and confidence shall continue to animate and encourage mutual efforts in promoting and multiplying common benefits; or whether mutual hatred and distrust shall step in to check all progress; to distract and confound all joint endeavors for the common welfare; in fine, to entail upon the country all the evils of endless discord. That is the question. AND WHEN YOU PRESENT THAT ISSUE TO ME, I SAY GIVE ME SEPARATION; GIVE ME DISUNION; GIVE ME ANYTHING IN PREFERENCE TO A UNION SUSTAINED ONLY BY POWER, BY CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL TIES, WITHOUT RECIPROCAL TRUST AND CONFIDENCE. IF OUR FUTURE CAREER IS TO BE ONE OF ETERNAL DISCORD, OF ANGRY CRIMINATION AND RECRIMINATION, GIVE ME RATHER SEPARATION WITH ALL ITS CONSEQUENCES. If I am to be at peace, let it be peace in reality; and if I am to be at war, let me know it at once, that I may put my house in order and be ready to meet the consequences."—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong. page 1101.

We affirm that this goes farther than even Mr. Yancey and Mr. Keitt have gone. *They* are for the Union on the basis of the Constitution, but Mr. Bell preferred disunion—"SEPARATION WITH ALL ITS CONSEQUENCES" to "*angry crimination and recrimination*," merely angry words were enough for him. But we are not yet done with Mr. Bell. On the 18th of March, 1858, he made a speech in the Senate, from which we quote:

"When the North shall by any deliberate act, deprive the South of any fair, and just, and equal participation in the benefits of the Union—if, for example, the Territory (Kansas) now proposed to be admitted into the Union as a State, had not been subject to an interdict of slavery for thirty years—if it were a Territory such as that lying west of Arkansas, by climate adapted to slave labor, and by population already a slave Territory; and if on application of such a Territory for admission into the Union as a slave State, the powerful North, without any of the feelings and sentiments growing out of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in regard to Kansas, should deliberately announce to the South "you shall have no more slave States," *that would afford a pretext with which the South might, with some reason, and with some assurance of the approval of the civilized world, and of posterity,* SEEK TO DISSOLVE THE UNION."—App. 1st Sess. 35th Congress, page 132.

The very contingencies laid down by Mr. Bell have happened so far as the Republican party is concerned. They have proclaimed to the South in their platform, "You shall have no more slave States.' The election of Mr. Lincoln will be the deliberate" announcement of the decision of the "powerful North" to that effect, and Mr. Bell then stands pledged "TO SEEK TO DISSOLVE THE UNION." And yet he is *par excellence* the Union candidate!

MILLARD FILLMORE, OF NEW YORK.

Mr. Fillmore needs no introduction at our hands. While a candidate for the Presidency in 1856, he made some speeches, one notable one at Albany, where he took the position that the election of Fremont would lead to a dissolution of the Union, just as Mr. Keitt says now of the election of Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Fillmore said:

"We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency selected, for the first time, from the free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages of one part of the Union only, to rule over the whole United States. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the *consequences* which must *inevitably follow* in case of success? Can they have the *madness* or the *folly* to believe that our southern brethren would *submit* to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate. * * * Suppose that the South, having a majority of the electoral votes, should declare that they would have only slaveholders for President and Vice-President, and should elect such by their exclusive suffrages to rule over us at the North; do you think *you would submit to it?*—NO, NOT FOR A MOMENT. And do you believe that your southern brethren are less sensitive on this subject than you are, or less jealous of their rights. If you do, let me tell you that you are mistaken; and, therefore you must see that if this sectional party succeeds, it leads INEVITABLY TO THE DESTRUCTION OF THIS BEAUTIFUL FABRIC, reared by our forefathers, &c. * * * I tell you that *we are treading upon the brink of a volcano*, that is liable at any moment *to burst forth* and OVERWHELM THE NATION."

Again, in his Rochester speech, Mr. Fillmore said:

"Suppose the South was the most populous, the most wealthy, and possessed the greatest number of electoral votes, and that it should declare that for some fancied or real injustice done at the North, it would elect none but a President and Vice-President of slaveholders from the South to rule over the North. Do you think fellow-citizens, that *you would submit to this* injustice? NO, *truly you would not; but one universal cry of* NO would rend the skies! And can you suppose your southern brethren less sensitive than yourselves, or less jealous of their rights? If you do, let me tell you that you are much mistaken - and you must therefore, perceive that *the success of such a party*, with such an object, MUST BE A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION."

We fail to comprehend the force of the English language, if these speeches did not counsel the South to resistance and disunion in case Fremont was elected.

W. L. UNDERWOOD, OF KENTUCKY,

Was a member of the 34th Congress, and is now a prominent supporter of Mr. Bell. He said:

"I ask that gentleman, and those who entertain such (Black Republican) views, and present them continually from day to day, if they are disposed to follow out the conclusions and consequences of their arguments? If so, *the day will come when this bond of Union*, which has united us so long, WILL CEASE LONGER TO

EXIST."—App. Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 34th Cong. page 1166.

BENJAMIN H. HILL, OF GEORGIA,

Is the leading Bell advocate and the Bell elector at large in his State. He delivered a speech at Macon, on the 30th June last. After arguing ably in favor of the right of the South to protection in the Territories. Mr. Hill says:

"If the experiment is forced, the fact will turn out to be, in my humble judgment, *that this Government and Black Republicanism* CANNOT LIVE TOGETHER. * * * At no period of the world's history have four thousand millions of property debated whether it *ought* to submit to the rule of an enemy."

A. BURWELL, OF MISSISSIPPI,

A prominent supporter of Mr. Bell, has, under date of August 10th, 1860, addressed a letter to ex-Gov. Foote, which we find published in the New York Herald, preceded by a most complimentary notice and endorsement by Mr. Foote. In this letter, Mr. Burwell says, in the event that Mr. Lincoln is elected:

"I know no man in the South who will, in such an event, take up and bear the standard of the Union, nor do I believe that any such exist."

A. R. BOTELER, OF VIRGINIA,

Is a member of the present Congress and chairman of the Bell and Everett National Executive Committee. In the latter capacity he has recently issued an address, in which he says that the "election of Lincoln would expose the Union to peril," and then adds:

"And further, we do say that the attempt to govern the country upon the distinctive and peculiar principles of the Republican party would be FATAL TO THE UNION."

He closes by saying that any attempt to exclude slavery from the national domain "would BREAK UP THE UNION."

THE PHILADELPHIA JOURNAL,

A leading Bell and Everett paper in Pennsylvania, says that as soon as Lincoln is elected "the compact of Confederation will be practically broken up."

"The fact of DISUNION WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED before a single southern State can take the first formal step towards secession."

It closes the article by charging that the Republican party "is making it *impossible* for the South to remain in the Union *consistently with honor and self-respect.*"

H. W. HILLIARD, OF ALABAMA,

Is still another ex-member of Congress, and the leading advocate of Mr. Bell in that State. Let us hear from him.

"The time is come not only to *resist* the measures which now threaten the southern States, but to *demand guarantees for their future protection.* (Here is Mr. Calhoun's amendment to the Constitution again.) * * * For one, sir, I AM FOR OFFERING BATTLE AT ONCE. *I am for staking everything upon a single field.* * * * You may almost hear the tones in which the southern people announce their solemn purpose, not only to *resist* upon threatened encroachments *but to demand guarantees for their future safety.*"—Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong. page 359.

Again, on page 33 of the Appendix:

"I solemnly declare that if this legislation is to be persisted in, THIS UNION CANNOT STAND. A brave, generous, high-spirited people, who comprehend their rights, &c., will, under the pressure of a great necessity, BREAK OFF AN ALLIANCE which employs the machinery of a common government against them, without pausing to cast up its value. * * It is of no avail that you point to a future of convulsion and blood which lies beyond the hour of our seperation. *Anything* is to be preferred to an ignominious submission to tyranny."

JEREMIAH CLEMENS, OF TENNESEE,

Mr. Clemens was formerly United States Senator from Alabama, but now lives in Tennesee, and is one of the editors of the Memphis Eagle and Enquirer, the leading Bell paper in that State. He acquired notoriety in the Senate for having rose one day in that body, and proclaimed that the Union was already dissolved! Hear him:

"You can deceive us no longer by the catch-words 'conciliation and harmony.' * * * * The North will not save the Union *and the South* CANNOT, unless indeed, we submit to indignities and wrongs of so degrading a character as would almost make our fathers 'burst the cements of the tombs, and come among us once more to denounce and disown the degenerate descendants who have disgraced a glorious ancestry. * * * When the Government is so administered as to oppress and grind down one portion of the Confederacy, *it ceases to be an object of veneration to me*, and I AM READY TO BURST ASUNDER ITS FIRMEST BONDS. * * * I have no threats to make, but I tell you, more in sorrow than in anger, not only that you must pause, but that you *must retrace your steps.* The guarantees of the Constitution must be respected and its promises held sacred, or the most weak and timid man in the State I in part represent, WOULD SCORN YOUR ALLIANCE, and SHATTER YOUR CONFEDERACY. Indeed, I do not know but what it is now TOO LATE, and that this Union, over which you have preached so much, and about which so many eloquent sentences have been framed, IS ALREADY AT AN END. Certainly, *you have severed many of of its strongest ties*, and but little more remains besides that FORMAL SEPARATION, which embittered feelings must soon render a *necessity.*"

LEANDER M. COX, OF KENTUCKY,

Is another ex-member of Congress, and a leading supporter of Bell and Everett. Let us hear him:

"When you tell me that you intend to put a restriction on the Territories, I say to you that upon that subject the South is a unit, and WILL NOT SUBMIT TO ANY SUCH THING."—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Ses. 34th Cong., page 32.

Again, page 1143, Mr. Cox said:

"But if the designs of parties purely sectional should be carried out, * * * then, sir, *the fate*

of the Republic will be FOREVER SEALED, and the historic chapter of American independence *closed in the tragic scenes of* CIVIL WAR.

JEREMIAH MORTON, OF VIRGINIA,

Another ex-member of Congress, and ardent supporter of Bell. Hear him:

"They (the North) now believe that the South is in earnest and *means to resist this aggression at every hazard and to the last extremity.* * * * The States have the right to require such legislation as may be necessary to protect the property of its citizens who may choose to emigrate to the Territories. * * We claim no superiority, but with the blessing of God, with strong hearts and firm nerves, *let whatever will come, the South cannot and will not permit* the brand of inferiority to be marked upon her forehead. * * * If this Government, which was intended as a shield, should trample under foot the rights of the South and the provisions of the Constitution; if the North appeal to the ballot-box (for the ballot-box has become sectional on this question) and ask us to submit, we will appeal to a violated charter; we will stand on the very foundation where our fathers stood; we will stand on the principles of '76, and the same spirit that animated them will animate their descendants. Think not you can press us to the wall, and *meet no resistance.* No! *Greek will meet Greek.* * * * Press that issue upon us *and we will appeal* TO THE GOD OF BATTLES with more faith and stronger confidence than our fathers did when they pledged 'life, fortune, and sacred honor."—App. 1st Sess. 31st Cong., pages 113, 115.

J. P. CAMPBELL, OF KY.

Was also a member of the 34th Congress. We quote from his speech delivered in the House:

"It is an interference with our institutions when our citizens are denied the same rights in the new Territories with the citizens from the North; for that Territory belongs to us as much as it does to you. * * * We regard this Confederacy as *secondary in importance,* and when a Government falters in carrying out its guarantees for the protection of life, liberty, and property, IT IS NO LONGER ENTITLED TO THE FEALTY OF ITS CITIZENS. And in addition to that, I will avow this sentiment, believing that it will be endorsed by my constituency, that whenever this Government makes a distinction between a southern and a northern constituency or citizenship, *then we shall consider ourselves no longer bound to support the Confederacy,* BUT WILL RESORT TO THE RIGHT OF REVOLUTION."—Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 34th Cong. page 56.

THE PLOT OF A WESTERN AND SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY.

We could multiply such extracts four-fold, but our allotted space will not permit. We have cited enough to convince every unprejudiced mind that the disunionists of this country are now enlisted under the banners of Douglas and Bell. And what is the plan? It is clearly foreshadowed in the speech delivered on the 15th December last in the House, by Hon. C. L. Vallandigham, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, and one of the ablest, most eloquent, and influential supporters of Mr. Douglas—also a delegate from Ohio in the Douglas Baltimore Convention. In that speech, occurs this remarkable passage:

"Did it never occur to you that when this most momentuous but most disastrous of all the events which history shall ever to the end of time record, (the dissolution of the Union,) shall have been brought about, *the West, the great West,* which you now coolly reckon your's as a province, your's as a fief of your vast empire, may choose of her own sovereign good will and pleasure, in the exercise of a popular sovereignty which will demand and will have non-intervention, *to set up for herself?* Did you never dream of a WESTERN CONFEDERACY?"

These are ominous words. The plot is about being carried out. *A Western Confederacy, of which Mr. Douglas is to be the head!*

A Southern Confederacy, of which, Johnson, Bell, Soule, Clemens, & Co., are to be the Chiefs! The Northern Confederacy will be handed over to Lincoln, Seward, & Co. All these parties are leagued together to compass Lincoln's election; then the southern disunionists supporting Douglas and Bell will raise the banner of disunion, and *then* these Confederacies are to be formed! This is the plot. It was to this end that the Douglas Executive Committee made haste to denounce all attempts to bring together the conservative vote of the country against Mr. Lincoln! It was to this end that Mr. Douglas himself proclaimed no fusion—no coalition, no union which the friends of Mr. Breckinridge! This infamous conspiracy ought to arouse the patriotism of the country to most superhuman efforts to overthrow and thwart it. Let the true Union men rally to the rescue—rally around the beleaguered flag of the Union and the Constitution, now so gallantly waving in the hands of the gifted and intrepid Kentuckian, and with "linked shields and dauntless steps, follow it to its noblest victory!"

WASHINGTON CITY—ISSUED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Prepared and Distributed by the Jackson Democratic Association.

71.2009.084.00914